arXiv:1109.6641v2 [hep-ph] 24 Oct 2011

OPERA and a Neutrino Dark Energy Model

Emilio Ciuffoli[1*], Jarah Evslin[1†], Jie Liu[2‡] and Xinmin Zhang[2,1§]

1) TPCSF, IHEP, Chinese Acad. of Sciences
2) Theoretical physics division, IHEP, Chinese Acad. of Sciences
YuQuan Lu 19(B), Beijing 100049, China

Abstract

We consider a neutrino dark energy model and study its implications for the neutrino superluminality reported recently by the OPERA collaboration. In our model the derivative couplings of the neutrino to the dark energy scalar result in a Lorentz violation in the neutrino sector. Furthermore, the coupling of the dark energy scalar field to the stress tensor of the Earth automatically leads to a nontrivial radial profile for the scalar which in turn yields a terrestrial neutrino $v-c$ far above its value in interstellar space, so as to be simultaneously compatible OPERA, MINOS and SN1987A data upon fitting a single parameter.

October 25, 2011

---

[*] emilio.ciuffoli@gmail.com
[†] `jarah@ihep.ac.cn`
[‡] liujie@ihep.ac.cn
[§] `xmzhang@ihep.ac.cn`

1 Introduction

Recently the OPERA experiment announced the arrival of 16,111 Swiss neutrinos, 61 nanoseconds ahead of schedule [1]. This complimented a similar, but less confident, announcement concerning less energetic American neutrinos four years ago [2]. Although the former of these announcements is claimed to be a 6 sigma event, as reviewed in Ref. [3] these claims have been met with a degree of skepticism because they need to be reconciled with a series of yet more solid observations:

1) Neutrinos from SN1987A [4, 5], after a 160,000 year trip, arrived on Earth at most 3 hours before the corresponding light [6]. The arrival time was essentially independent of the energy, with all neutrinos arriving within a 12.4 second window.
2) The non-trivial energy dependence of the survival probability of electron reactor neutrinos at KamLAND requires that the relevant Lorentz-violating couplings must be neutrino flavor-independent to within a precision of about 10^{-20} [7].

Naively the first of these observations is the most inconsistent with OPERA and MINOS's claims. OPERA found a fractional superluminality $(v-c)/c$ of $2.5\pm0.28\pm0.3\times10^{-5}$, MINOS found $5.1 \pm 2.9 \times 10^{-5}$ while SN1987A establishes a maximal fractional superluminality of 2×10^{-9}. One may seek consolation in the fact that SN1987A neutrinos are electron neutrinos whereas the others are muon neutrinos, but the second observation above makes this point irrelevant. Another difference is that the SN1987A neutrinos are in fact mostly antineutrinos, but no model has yet come forward which successfully exploits this difference.

A perhaps more useful distinction is the energy of these neutrinos. The SN1987A neutrinos lie between 7 and 39 MeV, while MINOS neutrinos peak at about 3 GeV with a long tail and OPERA neutrinos are largely between 10 and 50 GeV. Given the large errors, one may wish to simply throw out the MINOS results and fit the fractional superluminality with a powerlaw E^α where $\alpha \gtrsim 1.3$. A steep enough power law ($\alpha \gtrsim 2$) can be consistent with the nearly simultaneous arrival time of SN1987A neutrinos, as the superluminality may simply not have been observed. However OPERA also analyzed the energy-dependence of its neutrinos, separating them into two groups with average energies differing by a factor of 3 and found $\alpha = 0.1 \pm 0.6$, which is difficult but not impossible to reconcile with the aforementioned consistency condition. The next year of OPERA data should allow a more definitive conclusion on the plausibility of this scenario.

Even if next year's data confirms OPERA's superluminality claim, the possibility of a systematic error at OPERA remains. We will not attempt to determine whether such an error exists, but merely note that if future T2K and MINOS runs confirm OPERA's result then it must be taken seriously. With this motivation we will suspend our disbelief and describe a variation of the neutrino dark energy model of Ref. [9] which renders it consistent with neutrino data from SN1987A.

2 Neutrino Coupling and Dispersion Relations

To change the velocity of a neutrino, one needs to change its dispersion relation. This change necessarily violates Lorentz symmetry. We will consider spontaneous violations of Lorentz symmetry, which arise by adding terms to the Lagrangian which couple a new field to neutrino bilinears. The couplings and the new field are similar to those introduced in the neutrino dark energy model of Ref. [9], and to a large extent to those in the earlier models of Refs. [10], although we do not demand that the additional field actually provides the observed dark energy. The field acquires a VEV due to interactions with the Earth, which spontaneously breaks the Lorentz symmetry. In Refs. [13, 14, 15] such models were constructed in which the new fields introduced were respectively a symmetric tensor, a vector and a scalar. We will consider a scalar field Π, which as explained below will have the advantage that it requires the tuning of only a single parameter. The fact that our couplings resemble those which arise in the neutrino dark energy scenario of Ref. [9] yields a cosmological justification for the exclusiveness of these terms to the neutrino sector.

In an effective field theory setting, it is sufficient to consider the operators of lowest dimension which preserve Lorentz-invariance. The terms with no derivatives can be absorbed into redefinitions of the fields and parameters of the effective theory. Strong upper bounds on these terms arise, for example, on masses from beta decay and as a result these terms will be negligible at OPERA energies. We will be interested only in terms which cannot be reabsorbed into other terms via field definitions up to terms without derivatives. In general the modifications of the dispersion relation can be linear or quadratic in the new couplings, we will eventually restrict our restriction to the linear modifications and so to the coupling terms which lead to linear modifications. With all of these criteria, we are left with

$$\Delta\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\left(ia_{\mu}\bar{\nu}\partial^{\mu}\nu + ic_{\mu\nu}\bar{\nu}\gamma^{\mu}\partial^{\nu}\nu - d_{\mu\nu\rho}\bar{\nu}\gamma^{\mu}\partial^{\nu}\partial^{\rho}\nu\right) \tag{2.1}$$

where a, c and d are tensors constructed from derivatives of Π. In our dimensional analysis scheme, in which the coefficients are constructed from a scalar field of dimension $[m]$, the d in the last term is of higher dimensionality and so need not be considered, but we will keep it during this section for illustration as a linear energy dependence of neutrino superluminality is excluded at OPERA by less than two sigmas.

Clearly these derivative terms are nontrivial only if Π is not constant. OPERA and MINOS demand superluminality on Earth, while SN1987A neutrinos demand much less superluminality in space, therefore these derivatives need to be localized on Earth. The simplest possibility would be if $\dot{\Pi}$ were localized on Earth and vanishes in space, while $\partial_k \Pi$ vanishes everywhere. However it is easy to see that if Π begins with a constant value, the spatial gradients between here and SN1987A will dominate over the temporal gradient in less than a mere 160,000 years, much less than the age of the Earth. Therefore such field configurations are not logically consistent.

The next simplest possibility is that $\dot{\Pi}$ is negligible but the gradient of Π lies along the Earth's radial direction r. In Sec. 3 we will describe a prototypical example of a scalar field with the desired behavior. For now, it will simply be relevant that the only nonzero derivatives, and so the only nonzero components of the tensors a, c and d, will be those with only r indices or an even number of identical tangential indices. Then the dispersion relation is

$$E = \sqrt{P'^2 + M'^2} \tag{2.2}$$

with ith spatial component

$$P'_i = p_i + c_{ij} p_j + d_{ijk} p_j p_k \qquad M' = m + a_j p_j \tag{2.3}$$

where sums over repeated indices are understood.

Notice that as in the model of Ref. [14] and unlike that of Ref. [13], the dispersion relation is anisotropic. In particular, the velocity of a neutrino at the point p traveling at an angle θ with respect to the radial direction is

$$\frac{v-c}{c} \simeq \frac{a_x^2}{2}\cos^2\theta + \left(c_{xx}\cos^2\theta + c_{yy}\sin^2\theta\right) + 2E\cos\theta\left(d_{xxx}\cos^2\theta + 3d_{xyy}\sin^2\theta\right) \tag{2.4}$$

where, without loss of generality, we have chosen our coordinates such that, at p, $y = z = 0$ while the neutrino's velocity is in the $x - y$ plane.

As mentioned above in the sequel we will ignore the last term as it is created by a higher dimensional operator in our effective field theory description. Notice that c_{xx} and a_x only occur in the combination $c_{xx} + a_x^2/2$ at this precision. The terms which we have omitted are strongly suppressed, by factors of the superluminality fraction or even by the ratio of the neutrino energy to its rest mass, and so the identification of further terms or even the separate identification of c_{xx} and a_x will need to await a much more precise or qualitatively different experimental setting. As we can then not hope to experimentally distinguish between the effects of c_{xx} and a_x, we will simply neglect a_x in what follows. Working with the effective lagrangian with a $SU_L(2) \times U_Y(1)$ symmetry, the second operator in Eq.(2.1) is given by

$$\Delta\mathcal{L} = -b(\partial^\mu\partial^\nu\Pi)(H^\dagger\bar{L})\gamma_\mu\partial_\nu(LH) \tag{2.5}$$

were we have defined the constant b

$$c_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{b\langle v\rangle^2}{2}\langle\partial_\mu\partial_\nu\pi\rangle \tag{2.6}$$

and the H is the Higgs doublet of the standard model. In Ref. [15] the author considers a term which couples the neutrino kinetic tensor to $\partial_\mu\Pi\partial_\nu\Pi$. However this term is of one energy dimension greater than (2.5), and so is suppressed according to the usual logic of effective field theories.

At this point one may already fit to the OPERA data to find c on Earth. Instead we will find it convenient to first describe our simple scalar model which determines c in terms of the derivatives of a scalar field in Sec. 3. We will then fit this parameter to the OPERA result in Sec. 4.

3 The Model

A crucial difference between neutrinos observed by OPERA and those emitted by SN1987A is that the first traveled within the Earth, while most of the journey of the later was in interstellar space. Thus the discrepancy between these observations can be accounted for if the velocity of a neutrino is higher within the Earth than in space. This can be arranged in a number of inequivalent ways, by considering models in which the neutrino propagator is modified by a kinetic coupling of the neutrino to a field which obtains a VEV, if this messenger field is coupled to the Earth. In Ref. [16], for example, the authors proposed that this spatial dependence can emerge in type IIB string theory model.

No such coincidence is required in models in which the messenger is coupled directly to baryon density or to the background stress tensor in such a way that it acquires a classical expectation value concentrated near massive objects. So long as this classical field drops off sufficiently quickly from the sources, it will affect terrestrial neutrinos and not appreciably affect supernova neutrinos. However it is important that the field drops off sufficiently quickly so that the Earth's effects dominate preferably over those of the Sun and certainly over those of the center of the galaxy. In Ref. [13] this was achieved by adding a spin two field whose inverse mass is fixed by hand to be roughly the inverse radius of the Earth (and necessarily less than the inverse distance to the Sun), while the coupling was chosen to yield the OPERA superluminality. In this note we will present an alternative model in which the coupling is still chosen to agree with the OPERA result, but the effects of the Sun and Galaxy are suppressed not by tuning another parameter, but simply by the derivative structure of our coupling to the neutrinos.

We consider a model with the neutrino dark energy term (2.5) coupling the neutrino to a scalar field with or without a minimal Galileon coupling [17] given by the boundary DGP model [18]

$$\mathcal{L}_\Pi = -\frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\Pi\partial^\mu\Pi - \frac{a}{2}(\Box\Pi)(\partial_\nu\Pi)^2 + 4\sqrt{3\pi G_N}\Pi T. \tag{3.1}$$

The coefficient a, which *can* be taken to be zero, is a parameter of dimension $[l^3]$ which parameterizes the nonlinear Galileon interaction. T is the trace of the stress tensor of all of the matter, except for the scalar. The coupling of Π to the stress tensor could in principle lead to fifth forces beyond experimental bounds, as described in a very similar setting in Ref. [19], however a quick calculation shows that only the product of the coefficient of this coupling and the coefficient b in (2.5) appears in the neutrino $v-c$, therefore any reduction of the coefficient of the stress tensor coupling which may be mandated by fifth force constraints can be compensated by an opposite rescaling of b. While the Lagrangian itself has higher derivative terms, terms in the equations of motion have at most two derivatives acting on each Π, which allows the existence of ghost-free solutions such as that which we will use.

The Galileon interaction term is useful because it reduces short distance singularities, via the Vainshtein mechanism [20], at least in the presence of spherically symmetric stress tensor sources. More precisely, for an external source of mass M there will be a distance scale [18]

$$R = \frac{(\pi G_N)^{1/6}}{\sqrt{3}}\,(4aM)^{1/3} \tag{3.2}$$

at which the behavior of the Π field changes. We can choose the Galileon coupling a such that this distance is either larger than or smaller than the radius of the Earth r. For concreteness, in the rest of this note, we will chose a to be sufficiently small so that $R << r$, and so we will set $a = 0$ in the rest of this section. A small value of a is useful for, among other things, avoiding the potential formation of closed timelike curves [21]. However a will again become important for distance scales smaller than R, for example it may be invoked for neutrino phenomenology in neutron stars and, depending on its value, in the cores of massive stars.

Let us now calculate a static, spherically symmetric field configuration $\Pi(r)$ in the presence of a nonrelativistic matter source with density $\rho(r)$. The Π equation of motion is then

$$-4\sqrt{3\pi G_N}\rho = \nabla^2\Pi = \frac{1}{r^2}\partial_r(r^2\partial_r\Pi). \tag{3.3}$$

This is easily integrated to yield

$$r^2\partial_r\Pi = -4\sqrt{3\pi G_N}\int_{\tilde{r}=0}^{\tilde{r}=r}\tilde{r}^2\rho d\tilde{r} = -\sqrt{\frac{3G_N}{\pi}}M(r) \tag{3.4}$$

where $M(r)$ is the density contained in the object up to a radius r, and we have fixed the constant of integration by imposing that Π be differentiable at the origin.

One can now easily find the second derivatives of Π, which appear in the coupling (2.5). Choosing our coordinates such that $y = z = 0$ at a given point

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_z^2\Pi &= \partial_y^2\Pi = \frac{1}{r}\partial_r\Pi = -\sqrt{\frac{3G_N}{\pi}}\frac{M(r)}{r^3} && (3.5) \\ \partial_x^2\Pi &= \nabla^2\Pi - \partial_y^2\Pi - \partial_z^2\Pi = -4\sqrt{3\pi G_N}\left(\rho(r) - \frac{M(r)}{2\pi r^3}\right) && (3.6) \end{aligned}$$

while terms with mixed derivatives vanish. In particular, in the Earth's crust

$$\partial_x^2\Pi = 4\sqrt{3\pi G_N}(\frac{2}{3}\rho_0 - \rho), \qquad \partial_y^2\Pi = \partial_z^2\Pi = -4\sqrt{\frac{\pi G_N}{3}}\rho_0 \tag{3.7}$$

where ρ and ρ_0 are respectively the average densities of the crust and of the Earth as a whole. More generally, Eq. (3.7) may be applied to a point at any radius r in a background with an arbitrary spherically symmetric density profile if one identifies ρ with the density at radius r and ρ_0 with the average density at radii less than r.

4 Fitting

4.1 OPERA, MINOS and SN1987A

The equation (2.5) modifies the dispersion relation for the neutrinos, allowing superluminal propagation. In the language of Ref. [13] this corresponds to a modification of the effective metric in which the neutrinos propagate. The fractional superluminal neutrino velocity at an angle θ with respect to the radial direction is given by inserting Eq. (2.6) into (2.4)

$$\epsilon = \frac{v-c}{c} = -\frac{b\langle v\rangle^2}{2}(\partial_x^2\Pi(r)\cos^2(\theta) + \partial_y^2\Pi(r)\sin^2(\theta)), \tag{4.1}$$

where $\langle v\rangle$ is the Higgs VEV. In the case of OPERA and MINOS, $\cos^2(\theta) \sim .01$ and so we will ignore the first term. Using Eq. (3.7) one finds

$$\epsilon = \frac{v-c}{c} = 2b\sqrt{\frac{\pi G_N}{3}}\langle v\rangle^2\rho_0 \sim (800\ eV)^5 b \tag{4.2}$$

where we have used $\rho_0 \sim 5.5$ gm/cm^3. And so the OPERA result $\epsilon \sim 3 \times 10^{-5}$ is reproduced if

$$b \sim \frac{1}{(6 \text{ keV})^5}. \tag{4.3}$$

Of course, this fit is only reasonable if the main source of superluminality is the Earth. In other words, the main contribution to Π must arise from its coupling to the Earth, and not for example the Sun or the matter in our galaxy. In the case of a distance object, the ρ term in Eq. (3.6) vanishes, while the other terms are simply the ratio of the total mass to the distance cubed. Therefore, at the surface of the Earth, the contribution of the Sun (with respect to that of the Earth) is suppressed by a factor of 10^{-8} and that of the galaxy by 10^{-25}, thus it is reasonable to ignore these contributions. In the case of the model in Ref. [13] the corresponding M/R dependence would lead to a dominant contribution from the Sun and galaxy, and so these contributions are eliminated by hand by choosing the mass of their new field to be of order the inverse radius of the Earth.

And so what about neutrinos from SN1987A? The fractional superluminality for these neutrinos needs to be less than 10^{-9}. This is easily satisfied, as one can see by directly calculating the change in arrival time, or else simply noting that nearly all of the trip is in interstellar space, where ϵ is of order 10^{-30}. In fact, examining Eq. (3.6) more closely, one sees that during the first part of their trip the neutrinos are actually subluminal.

4.2 KamLAND

Fitting the OPERA and MINOS results is easy, one need merely add a Lorentz-violating term to the muon neutrino sector. The SN1987A neutrinos are then not a problem, so long as the electron neutrino sector is unaltered. This is also consistent with LEP synchrotron limits, as these concern electrons, if one ignores flavor mixings. The limits on muon Lorentz violation placed by gamma rays arriving from blazars [22] are violated, but since our scalar is only appreciable during a small portion of this trip, the relevance of these bounds to OPERA physics is unclear. However as we have alluded earlier, the biggest problem arises from KamLAND's reactor neutrino oscillation data. This suggests that certain terms which violate Lorentz-invariance in the muon neutrino sector must be equal in the electron neutrino sector. No such analysis has been carried out, however, for every possible term in our low energy effective description. In this subsection we will comment on the possibility of evading these bounds within the validity of the effective theory.

KamLAND lies between 55 nuclear reactors, which supply it with antineutrinos. The electron neutrinos oscillate into muon neutrinos. If the energy difference between an electron and muon neutrino is ΔE, the probability that a given electron neutrino is still an electron neutrino after traveling a distance L is

$$1-\sin^2(2\theta_{e\mu})\sin^2\left(\frac{L\Delta E}{2}\right) \tag{4.4}$$

where $\theta_{e\mu}$ is the mixing angle between these two flavors. Using the dispersion relation (2.2) one readily finds, for an energy E neutrino, that the latter phase is

$$L\left(\frac{\delta m^2}{2E}+\left(a_z^{(e)2}+2c_{zz}^{(e)}-a_z^{(\mu)2}-2c_{zz}^{(\mu)}\right)E\cos^2\theta+2\left(c_{yy}^{(e)}-c_{yy}^{(\mu)}\right)E\sin^2\theta+\right.$$

$$\left.\left(2\left(d_{xxx}^{(e)}-d_{xxx}^{(\mu)}\right)\cos^2\theta+3\left(d_{xyy}^{(e)}-d_{xyy}^{(\mu)}\right)\sin^2\theta\right)E^2\cos^2\theta\right) \tag{4.5}$$

where δm^2 is the difference between the squared masses of the two relevant neutrino mass eigenstates and the e and μ superscripts denote the Lorentz-violating neutrino couplings to the two flavors respectively. Now inserting coefficients $2c+a^2$ which are sufficiently large to fit the OPERA data, together with an energy $E=5$ MeV typical of reactor neutrinos seen above the background at KamLAND, one finds that neutrinos oscillate about every 5 nanometers. This is much smaller than the resolution at KamLAND, and so KamLAND would in this case find an energy-independent survival probability. This is in grave contradiction with KamLAND's results in Ref. [7] which present two full averaged neutrino oscillations. Higher order terms, such as the d term, lead to an even shorter wavelength but with an E dependence which cannot cancel that of previous terms. Therefore a cancellation in such terms, in order to be consistent with KamLAND's results, must be imposed order by order in E, and in fact also order in order in $\cos(\theta)$, which is small but still larger than the ratio of the energy to the neutrino mass. Such a cancellation is not possible with the terms in the lowest orders of the effective action considered in this note.

5 Experimental Signatures

Once one has included the interaction term (2.5) to explain superluminal neutrino velocities here on Earth, one needs to deal with its consequences throughout our universe. In particular, it may become appreciable inside of various astrophysical objects. In the case of a spherically symmetric object, Eq. (3.7) tells us that the superluminality at a radius r only depends on the density ρ at that radius and the average density at lower radii ρ_0. This may seem peculiar, since there is no Gauss' law for Π. Indeed, any choice of boundary conditions for Π implies that its value in the core of an object depends on the ρ profile at higher radii. However in our model, and not in that of Refs. [13, 14], the superluminality only depends on the second derivatives of Π, which is independent of the constants of integration and so of these boundary conditions. This freedom in choosing boundary conditions is necessary for many cosmological applications of the Π field, such as the dark energy model of Ref. [9] and Galileon cosmologies.

In the core of a spherically symmetric object, in which the density is approximately constant, the superluminality is easily approximated. Up to geometrical factors whose magnitude and sign depend on the direction in which the neutrino travels, the fractional superluminosity of neutrinos is simply given by the ratio of the OPERA result to the ratio of the average density of the Earth to that of the object's core. For example in the case of the core of our Sun, whose density varies between 4 and 30 times that of the Earth, one expects a neutrino fractional subluminosity or superluminosity of order between 10^{-4} and 10^{-3}. This change in the neutrino's dispersion relation affects its propagator and so may in principle have observable consequences on the various fusion processes occurring in our solar core, perhaps allowing for an exclusion or verification of our model. This is in contrast with the model of Ref. [13], in which neutrino superluminality is of order 1 at the surface of the Sun and persists at greater depths including the outer core, where a significant amount of fusion occurs.

However, even in our model the superluminality will be of order 1 whenever the density reaches about $2 \times 10^5\ g/cm^3$. This level is easily surpassed for example in the cores of older massive stars which fuse carbon or heavier elements Ref. [23], and is even reached in white dwarves. Thus in these situations one may expect drastic departures from the standard Lorentz-invariant quantum field theory predictions for amplitudes and decay rates involving the neutrino propagator, potentially affecting for example models of the helium flash.

Another crucial distinction between our model and that of Ref. [13] is that our neutrino velocity is direction-dependent, radially traveling neutrinos on the surface of the Earth are subluminal. For shallow angles such as those of OPERA, MINOS and T2K the neutrino superluminality in our model is reasonably independent of the angle, there is only a correction of order the angle $(\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta)$ squared. On the other hand, in the second model of Ref. [14], the superluminality is proportional to the cosine of the angle with respect to a preferred direction, which given the symmetries of the problem will likely correspond to the Earth's radial direction. As the baseline of T2K is half that of the others, this cosine is only one half of its value in OPERA and MINOS, and so the second model of Ref. [14] suggests that the neutrino $(v-c)/c$ at T2K is about one half its value at OPERA, corresponding to a neutrino arrival time only 14 nanoseconds ahead of schedule. Thus if future T2K runs indicate no superluminality, that model is unlikely to be ruled out. On the other hand, to distinguish our model from that of Ref. [13] one needs a significantly larger angle, translating into a larger baseline. Almost an order of magnitude of improvement in the timing precision of OPERA (at both experiments) would be necessary to distinguish the models by comparing superluminality at OPERA and at Fermilab's proposed 1300 km baseline experiment LBNE. The prospects are improved significantly in the 2000+ km proposed experiments sending neutrinos from CERN to the Pyhäsalmi mine.

6 Electron Superluminality?

In addition to the experimental constraints listed in the introduction, one may add:

3) Bounds on terrestrial electron superluminality are extremely tight. At LEP [8], synchrotron radiation measurements at OPERA energies yield a maximum fractional superluminality $(v-c)/c$ of 5×10^{-15}.

Together with constaint (2), this implies that either the neutrino superluminality disappears before the electroweak scale, or else some conspiracy of other effects prevents it from being transmitted to the electron. The first scenario is very difficult to realize, especially in light of the fact that OPERA neutrino energies are already so close to the electroweak scale. For example in Ref. [3] the authors noted, as was shown in Ref. [10], that in the case of a coupling $\nu^\dagger \partial_0 \nu$, a one-loop mixing generates the operator $e^\dagger \partial_0 e$ which leads to a superluminality for electrons which is suppressed by at most E^2/M_W^2 with respect to that of neutrinos, and so is 5 orders of magnitude above the LEP bound quoted above. More complicated breaking models, such as the coupling to sterile neutrinos [10, 3] and supersymmetric completions [3], are able to push these effects onto higher derivative operators. However generically this merely increases the exponent of the E/M_W suppression, but since E/M_W is of order 0.1 it seems difficult to see how such models could be consistent with the LEP constraint.

One might hope that there exist flavor-asymmetric Lorentz-violating terms which evade the neutrino oscillation constraints of observation (2). In this case one could simply declare that Lorentz-violation only occurs for muon and perhaps tau neutrinos, hoping that their mixing with electrons is sufficiently suppressed to avoid the LEP synchrotron bound. There are a number of reasons why this approach fails, but we have seen (Subsec. 4.2) that our terms certainly do not allow such an evasion of the flavor neutrality constraints.

This leaves the second possibility for generating the required superluminality hierarchy. OPERA data, together with observations (2) and (3), appears to imply an extreme fine tuning which cancels the electron couplings leading to superluminality. Such a fine tuning can be achieved, at a fixed energy scale, by tuning bare values for the electron analogues of the coupling (2.5) and indeed it has been claimed that a cancellation is realized automatically in some models [11, 12]. Of course the electron coupling will in turn generate one-loop corrections to the neutrino coupling, and so a proper fit to the data in principle requires one to fit these two bare couplings simultaneously, and one may also wish to include such couplings for the other charged leptons, to satisfy for example Lorentz-violation bounds in the muon sector. While the (provisional) resolution of hierarchy problems via the fine-tuning of bare parameters is certainly familiar and perhaps even necessary in particle physics, in our opinion the need for this fine-tuning is among the most compelling reasons to suspect a systematic error in the OPERA data.

Acknowledgement

JE is supported by the Chinese Academy of Sciences Fellowship for Young International Scientists grant number 2010Y2JA01. EC, JL and XZ are supported in part by the NSF of China.

References

[1] T. Adam *et al.* [OPERA Collaboration], "Measurement of the neutrino velocity with the OPERA detector in the CNGS beam," [arXiv:1109.4897 [hep-ex]].

[2] P. Adamson *et al.* [MINOS Collaboration], "Measurement of neutrino velocity with the MINOS detectors and NuMI neutrino beam," Phys. Rev. **D76** (2007) 072005. [arXiv:0706.0437 [hep-ex]].

[3] G. F. Giudice, S. Sibiryakov, A. Strumia, "Interpreting OPERA results on superluminal neutrino," [arXiv:1109.5682 [hep-ph]].

[4] K. Hirata *et al.* [KAMIOKANDE-II Collaboration], "Observation of a Neutrino Burst from the Supernova SN 1987a," Phys. Rev. Lett. **58** (1987) 1490-1493.

[5] R. M. Bionta, G. Blewitt, C. B. Bratton, D. Casper, A. Ciocio, R. Claus, B. Cortez, M. Crouch *et al.*, "Observation of a Neutrino Burst in Coincidence with Supernova SN 1987a in the Large Magellanic Cloud," Phys. Rev. Lett. **58** (1987) 1494.

[6] I. Shelton, "Supernova 1987A in the Large Magellanic Cloud," IAU Circular No. 4316.

[7] S. Abe *et al.* [KamLAND Collaboration], "Precision Measurement of Neutrino Oscillation Parameters with KamLAND," Phys. Rev. Lett. **100** (2008) 221803. [arXiv:0801.4589 [hep-ex]].

[8] B. Altschul, "Bounding Isotropic Lorentz Violation Using Synchrotron Losses at LEP," Phys. Rev. **D80** (2009) 091901. [arXiv:0905.4346 [hep-ph]].

[9] P. Gu, X. Wang, X. Zhang, "Dark energy and neutrino mass limits from baryogenesis," Phys. Rev. **D68** (2003) 087301. [hep-ph/0307148].

[10] P. -H. Gu, X. -J. Bi, X. -m. Zhang, "Dark energy and neutrino CPT violation," Eur. Phys. J. **C50** (2007) 655-659. [hep-ph/0511027]; Shin'ichiro Ando, Marc Kamionkowski, Irina Mocioiu Neutrino "Oscillations, Lorentz/CPT Violation, and Dark Energy" Phys.Rev. **D80**, (2009) 123522.

[11] J. R. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos, D. V. Nanopoulos and A. S. Sakharov, "Space-time foam may violate the principle of equivalence," Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **19** (2004) 4413 [arXiv:gr-qc/0312044].

[12] G. Cacciapaglia, A. Deandrea and L. Panizzi, "Superluminal neutrinos in long baseline experiments and SN1987a," arXiv:1109.4980 [hep-ph].

[13] G. Dvali, A. Vikman, "Price for Environmental Neutrino-Superluminality," [arXiv:1109.5685 [hep-ph]].

[14] J. Alexandre, J. Ellis, N. E. Mavromatos, "On the Possibility of Superluminal Neutrino Propagation," [arXiv:1109.6296 [hep-ph]].

[15] A. Kehagias, "Relativistic Superluminal Neutrinos," [arXiv:1109.6312 [hep-ph]].

[16] T. Li, D. V. Nanopoulos, "Background Dependent Lorentz Violation from String Theory," [arXiv:1110.0451 [hep-ph]].

[17] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi, E. Trincherini, "The Galileon as a local modification of gravity," Phys. Rev. **D79** (2009) 064036. [arXiv:0811.2197 [hep-th]].

[18] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi, "Classical and quantum consistency of the DGP model," JHEP **0406** (2004) 059. [hep-th/0404159].

[19] L. Iorio, "Environmental fifth-force hypothesis for the OPERA superluminal neutrino phenomenology: constraints from orbital motions around the Earth," [arXiv:1109.6249 [gr-qc]].

[20] A. I. Vainshtein, "To the problem of nonvanishing gravitation mass," Phys. Lett. **B39** (1972) 393-394.

[21] J. Evslin, T. Qiu, "Closed Timelike Curves in the Galileon Model," [arXiv:1106.0570 [hep-th]].

[22] B. Altschul, "Astrophysical limits on Lorentz violation for all charged species," Astropart. Phys. **28** (2007) 380-384. [hep-ph/0610324].

[23] K. Nomoto, "Evolution of 8 to 10 solar mass stars toward electron capture supernovae II," Astro. Jour. **322** (1987) 206.